Attorney Docket No.: Q96663

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) U.S. Application No.: 10/590,605

## REMARKS

In the present Amendment, independent claims 1, 15 and 23 have been amended to recite that the light diffusing sheet comprises a light emission side on one surface, and a light entrance side on the other surface, and that the fine recesses are formed in the surface on the light emission side. Section 112 support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Figures 1-7 of the specification. In addition, claims 20-22 and 24 have been amended to be consistent with the amendments to claims 1, 15 and 23. No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9 and 15-24 are pending.

Initially, Applicants believe that the Examiner intended to indicate that the drawings filed November 28, 2007 are accepted and respectfully request the Examiner to confirm the same.

In paragraph No. 2 of the Action, claim 1 is objected to because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the surfaces" in line 2 of clam 1.

As noted, claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's concern. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

In paragraph No. 4 of the Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ohkawa (US 6,485,157).

In paragraph No. 12 of the Action, claims 7, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ohkawa.

Applicants submit that the above two rejections should be withdrawn because Ohkawa does not disclose or render obvious the present invention.

Attorney Docket No.: Q96663

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) U.S. Application No.: 10/590,605

The light guide plate of Ohkawa is, as is apparent from Fig. 5, a structure in which the emission face 33 is provided with a great number of projection rows (col. 5, lines 54-61), and micro-reflectors 90 are configurated so as to be projected from the back face 34 (col. 3, lines 32-34, col. 3, lines 43-47, col. 8, lines 30-33; and especially in col. 3, lines 43-47, there is the description "is configurated as to be projected"), and is a structure in which light entering from the incidence end face 32 is reflected by the micro-reflectors 90 on the back face 34, and converted to the emission face 33.

In contrast, the light diffusing sheet of the present application is, as shown in Fig. 3 of the specification, a structure in which the fine recesses 3 are disposed in the light emission side 2, and is a structure in which light entering from the light entrance side 5 is diffused by the fine recesses 3 in the light emission side 2, and converted to diffused light having a small brightness peak angle, so that generation of a moire or interference fringe or luminance unevenness is inhibited.

The Examiner considers "the micro-reflectors on the back face" of Ohkawa to be the same as "the fine recesses in the light emission side" recited in the present claims.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As recited in the present claims, the fine recesses are disposed in the light emission side, whereas in Ohkawa, the micro-reflectors are disposed on the back face (i.e., on a surface opposite to the "emission face" that is a light emission side).

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) Attorney Docket No.: Q96663

Further, a pyramid etc. is disposed as a recess fallen from the light emission side as

U.S. Application No.: 10/590,605

recited in the present claims, whereas in Ohkawa, the micro-reflectors are formed so as to be

projected from the surface.

With regard to the light diffusing agent, Applicants disclose that a light diffusing agent

may be particles of particulate inorganic materials or metal oxides, or beads of particulate

organic polymers. See paragraph [0030] at page 20 of the specification. Accordingly, a light

diffusing agent is not a film or a panel. The definition of "a light diffusing agent" is known to

one skilled in the art.

Accordingly, the constitution of the present invention and the constitution of Ohkawa are

completely different from each other.

As to claim 6, Ohkawa discloses that parameter  $\theta$ r is preferably designed as to be zero

degrees or within a range such as from 0 to 18 degrees (col. 10, lines 29-31 and col. 12, lines 43-

47). With due respect, it is unclear how the Examiner arrived at "15-17 degrees" for the oblique

angle of Ohkawa (first line at page 4 of the Action).

Further, Applicants disclose that the light diffusing sheets having fine recesses having the

shape of an inverted regular quadrangular pyramid or a nearly semispherical shape have a better

luminance than the light diffusing sheet having microfine recesses and protrusions and the light

diffusing sheet having semispherical projections. See, Table 1 at page 61 and paragraph [0095]

at page 62 of the specification.

Ohkawa does not teach or suggest the unexpectedly superior results provided by the

present invention.

10

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No.: 10/590,605

Attorney Docket No.: Q96663

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§102(b)/103(a) rejections of

claims 1, 2, 5-9, 15-17, 19, 21 and 22 based on Ohkawa are respectfully requested.

In paragraph No. 26 of the Action, claims 18, 20, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ohkawa in view of Chang et al (US 7,210,835).

Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn for essentially the same

reasons that the previous rejections based on Ohkawa should be withdrawn, as discussed above.

Chang et al is relied upon as teaching a diffusion sheet with a UV ray absorption layer laminated

thereon (abstract and col. 3, lines 30-52). Chang et al does not make up for the deficiencies of

Ohkawa.

Allowance is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner

feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly

requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted

Josho 32,745

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Registration No. 57,426

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 20, 2008

11